

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NASSAU

X

NICOLE DEMARTINO f/k/a CARMEL-ANN NICOLE
IACONTINO,

Plaintiff,

-against-

THE DIOCESE OF ROCKVILLE CENTRE and ST.
MARTIN OF TOURS,

Defendants.

Date Index No. Purchased:

Index No.:

Plaintiff designates Nassau
County as the place of trial.

The basis of venue is Plaintiff's
residence.

SUMMONS

X

The Above-Named Defendants:

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED to answer the complaint in this action and to serve a copy of your answer, or, if the complaint is not served with this summons, to serve a notice of appearance, on the Plaintiff's Attorney(s) within twenty (20) days after the service of this summons, exclusive of the day of service (or within thirty (30) days after the service is complete if this summons is not personally delivered to you within the State of New York); and in case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment will be taken against you by default for the relief demanded in the complaint.


Dated: New York, New York
November 4, 2019

Yours, etc.,



By: Adam P. Slater, Esq.
SLATER SLATER SCHULMAN LLP
Counsel for Plaintiff
488 Madison Avenue, 20th Floor
New York, New York 10022
(212) 922-0906

-and-



By: Gary Certain, Esq.
CERTAIN & ZILBERG, PLLC
Counsel for Plaintiff
488 Madison Avenue, 20th Floor
New York, New York 10022

TO:

THE DIOCESE OF ROCKVILLE CENTRE
50 N Park Avenue
Rockville Centre, New York 11571

ST. MARTIN OF TOURS
220 Central Avenue
Bethpage, New York 11714

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK

X

NICOLE DEMARTINO f/k/a CARMEL-ANN NICOLE
IACONTINO,

Plaintiff,
-against-

Date Filed:
Index No.:

VERIFIED COMPLAINT

THE DIOCESE OF ROCKVILLE CENTRE and ST.
MARTIN OF TOURS,

Defendants.

X

Plaintiff, Nicole DeMartino (“Plaintiff”), by her attorneys Slater Slater Schulman LLP and Certain & Zilberg, PLLC, brings this action against the Diocese of Rockville Centre (“Diocese”) and St. Martin of Tours (“Church”) and alleges, on personal knowledge as to herself and on information and belief as to all other matters, as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This action is brought pursuant to the Children Victims Act (“CVA”) (L. 2019 c. 11). *See CPLR § 214-g and 22 NYCRR 202.72.*
2. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the Diocese pursuant to CPLR §§ 301 and 302, in that the Diocese either resides in New York or conducts or, at relevant times conducted, activities in New York that give rise to the claims asserted herein.
3. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the Church pursuant to CPLR §§ 301 and 302, in that the Church either resides in New York or conducts or, at relevant times conducted, activities in New York that give rise to the claims asserted herein.
4. This Court has jurisdiction over this action because the amount of damages Plaintiff seeks exceeds the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts which would otherwise have jurisdiction.

5. Venue for this action is proper in the County of Nassau pursuant to CPLR § 503 in that Plaintiff resides in this County, and a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims asserted herein occurred here.

PARTIES

6. Whenever reference is made to any defendant entity, such reference includes that entity, its parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, predecessors, and successors. In addition, whenever reference is made to any act, deed, or transaction of any entity, the allegation means that the entity engaged in the act, deed, or transaction by or through its officers, directors, agents employees, or representatives while they were actively engaged in the management, direction, control, or transaction of the entity's business affairs.

7. Plaintiff is an individual residing in Nassau County, New York. Plaintiff was an infant at the time of the sexual abuse alleged herein.

8. At all times material to the Verified Complaint, Diocese was and continues to be a non-profit religious corporation, organized exclusively for charitable, religious, and educational purposes within the meaning of Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

9. At all times material to the Verified Complaint, Diocese was and remains authorized to conduct business under the laws of the State of New York.

10. At all times material to the Verified Complaint, Diocese's principal place of business is 50 N Park Avenue, Rockville Centre, New York 11571.

11. The Diocese oversees a variety of liturgical, sacramental, educational and faith formation programs.

12. The Diocese has various programs that seek out the participation of children in its activities.

13. The Diocese, through its agents, servants, and/or employees has control over those activities involving children.

14. The Diocese has the power to employ individuals working with and/or alongside children, providing said children with guidance and/or instruction under the auspices of the defendant Diocese, including but not limited to those at the Church.

15. At all times material to the Verified Complaint, the Church was and continues to be a religious New York State non-profit entity.

16. At all times material to the Verified Complaint, the Church maintained its principal place of business at 220 Central Avenue, Bethpage, New York 11714.

17. At all times material to the Verified Complaint, the Church is a parish operating under the control of the Diocese.

18. At all times material to the Verified Complaint, the Church is a parish operating for the benefit of the Diocese.

19. At all times material to the Verified Complaint, Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti were volunteers, agents, servants, and/or employees of the Church.

20. At all times material to the Verified Complaint, Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti were volunteers, agents, servants, and/or employees of the Diocese.

21. At all times material to the Verified Complaint, while volunteers, agents, servants and/or employees of the Church, Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti remained under the control and supervision of the Diocese.

22. At all times material to the Verified Complaint, while volunteers, agents, servants and/or employees of the Church, Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti remained under the control and supervision of the Church.

23. At all times material to the Verified Complaint, while volunteers, agents, servants and/or employees of the Diocese, Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti remained under the control and supervision of the Diocese.

24. At all times material to the Verified Complaint, while volunteers, agents, servants and/or employees of the Diocese, Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti remained under the control and supervision of the Church.

25. The Church placed Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti in positions where they had immediate access to children.

26. The Diocese placed Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti in positions where they had immediate access to children.

**THE CATHOLIC CHURCH'S LONG HISTORY
OF COVERING UP CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE**

27. In 1962, the Vatican in Rome issued a Papal Instruction binding upon all Bishops throughout the world including the Bishop of the Diocese. The instruction was binding upon the Bishop of the Diocese. The instruction directed that allegations and reports of sexual abuse of children by priests were required to be kept secret and not disclosed either to civil authorities such as law enforcement, to co-employees or supervisors of parish priests, or to parishioners generally.

28. Canon law requires Bishops to keep *subsecreto* files also known as confidential files. These files are not to be made public.

29. Because of problems of sexual misconduct of Catholic clergy, the Catholic Church and other organizations sponsored treatment centers for priests that had been involved in sexual misconduct, including centers in Albuquerque, New Mexico, Suitland, Maryland, Downington Pennsylvania, and Ontario, Canada.

30. Sexual abuse of clerics by Catholic clergy has been a reality in the Catholic Church for centuries but has remained covered by deep secrecy. This secrecy is rooted in the official policies of the Catholic Church which are applicable to all dioceses and in fact are part of the practices of each diocese, including the Diocese. Sexual abuse of minors by Catholic clergy and religious leaders became publicly known in the mid 1980's as a result of media coverage of a case in Lafayette, Louisiana. Since that time, the media has continued to expose cases of clergy sexual abuse throughout the United States. In spite of these revelations as well as the many criminal and civil litigations the Church has been involved in as a result of clergy sexual abuse of minors, the bishops and other Church leaders continued to pursue a policy of secrecy.

31. All of the procedures required in the so-called "Dallas Charter" to purportedly protect children have been previously mandated in the Code of Canon Law but were consistently ignored by Catholic bishops. In place of the required processes, which would have kept a written record of cases of clergy sexual abuse, the bishops applied a policy of clandestine transfer of accused priests from one local or diocesan assignment to another or from one diocese to another. The receiving parishioners and often the receiving pastors were not informed of any accusations of sexual abuse of minors.

32. The truth concerning the extent of the frequency of sexual abuse at the hands of Catholic priests and Catholic Church's pervasive campaign to cover up such crimes continues to be revealed. In approximately 2003, the Suffolk County Supreme Court Special Grand Jury issued a Report ("Grand Jury Report"), which investigated child sexual abuse by the Diocese's priests. The Report documented the Diocese's cover up of sexual abuse. In the course of the Grand Jury investigation, it heard testimony from 97 witnesses and considered hundreds of pages of documents regarding priests of the Diocese sexually violating children.

33. The Grand Jury Report contains a number of startling observations and conclusions, including:

- "A general failure of supervision from officials of the Diocese, to individual pastors and other priests living in rectories, compounded and perpetuated these violations with devastating consequences for children."
- "Priests committed crimes against children of the Diocese. These crimes were treated as a matter of sin and never reported to law enforcement authorities."
- "The culture of the Diocese was one of secrecy and obfuscation. Diocesan officials purposely withheld information from parishioners and from their own priests and pastors."
- "Most children did not report the crimes against them until long after the criminal statute of limitations had lapsed. Those who did were promised help but received little. Instead, they were ignored, belittled and revictimized."
- "In some cases... the Diocese procrastinated for the sole purpose of making sure that the civil and criminal statutes of limitation were no longer applicable in the cases."
- "The policy was to avoid scandal by the suppression of information. Priests and Diocesan officials lied about what they knew about sexually abusive priests to their parishioners and to the public at large. This policy put children at grave risk."
- "The response of priests in the Diocesan hierarchy to allegations of criminal sexual abuse was no pastoral. In fact, although there was a written policy that set forth a pastoral tone, it was a sham."
- "Abusive priests were protected under the guise of confidentiality; their histories mired in secrecy. Professional treatment recommendations were ignored, and dangerous priests allowed to minister to children."

34. In approximately 2004, the Diocese publicly admitted that it knew of 66 priests who worked in the Diocese who had been accused of sexually molesting minors. The Diocese has never publicly released those names. As a result, children are at risk of being sexually molested. Further, the public is placed under the mistaken belief that Defendants do not have undisclosed knowledge of clerics who present a danger to children.

35. Refusal to disclose sexually abusing clerics to parishioners and even fellow clerics has been one way utilized by Defendant to maintain secrecy. Another has been to use various forms of persuasion on victims or their families to convince them to remain silent about incidents of abuse. These forms of persuasion have included methods that have ranged from sympathetic attempts to gain silence to direct intimidation to various kinds of threats. In so doing the clergy involved, from bishops to priests, have relied on their power to overwhelm victims and their families.

36. The sexual abuse of children and the Catholic Church's abhorrent culture of concealing these crimes are at the heart of the allegations complained of herein.

37. The Child Victims Act was enacted for the explicit purpose of providing survivors of child sexual abuse with the recourse to bring a private right of action against the sexual predators who abused them and the institutions that concealed their crimes.

FACTS

38. Plaintiff was raised in a devout Roman Catholic family and, in or around 1971, when Plaintiff was 3 years old, Plaintiff began attending the Church, a church within and under the auspices of the Diocese.

39. At all relevant times, Plaintiff participated in youth activities and church activities at the Church.

40. The Plaintiff received educational and religious instruction from the Church.

41. Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti, under the auspices of the Church and Diocese, provided educational and religious instruction to the infant Plaintiff.

42. During and through these activities, Plaintiff, as a minor and vulnerable child, was dependent on the Church and Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti.

43. During and through these activities, the Church had physical custody of Plaintiff and accepted the entrustment of Plaintiff.

44. During and through these activities, the Church had assumed the responsibility of caring for Plaintiff and had authority over her.

45. During and through these educational and religious instructional activities, Plaintiff, as a minor and vulnerable child, was dependent on the Diocese and Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti.

46. During and through these activities the Diocese had physical custody of Plaintiff and accepted the entrustment of Plaintiff.

47. During and through these activities, the Diocese had responsibility of Plaintiff and authority over her.

48. Through Frank Livoti's and Tilia Livoti's positions at, within, or for the Church, Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti were put in direct contact with Plaintiff, a member of the Church. It was under these circumstances that Plaintiff came to be under the direction, contact, and control of Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti, who used their positions of authority and trust over Plaintiff to sexually abuse and harass Plaintiff.

49. Through Frank Livoti's and Tilia Livoti's positions at, within, or for the Diocese, Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti were put in direct contact with Plaintiff, a member of the Church. It was under these circumstances that Plaintiff came to be under the direction, contact, and control of Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti, who used their position of authority and trust over Plaintiff to sexually abuse and harass Plaintiff.

50. On repeated occasions, while Plaintiff was a minor, Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti, while acting as counselors, teachers, trustees, directors, officers, employees, agents, servants

and/or volunteers of the Church, sexually assaulted, sexually abused and/or had sexual contact with Plaintiff in violation of the laws of the State of New York, including the New York State Penal Law.

51. On repeated occasions, while Plaintiff was a minor, Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti, while acting as counselors, teachers, trustees, directors, officers, employees, agents, servants and/or volunteers of the Diocese, sexually assaulted, sexually abused and/or had sexual contact with Plaintiff in violation of the laws of the State of New York, including the New York State Penal Law.

52. The abuse occurred approximately in or about 1975.

53. Plaintiff's relationship to the Church, as a vulnerable minor, parishioner and participant in Church educational and religious instructional activities, was one in which Plaintiff was subject to the Church's ongoing influence. The dominating culture of the Catholic Church over Plaintiff pressured Plaintiff not to report Frank Livoti's and Tilia Livoti's sexual abuse of her.

54. Plaintiff's relationship to the Diocese, as a vulnerable minor, parishioner and participant in Church educational and religious instructional activities, was one in which Plaintiff was subject to the Diocese's ongoing influence. The dominating culture of the Catholic Church over Plaintiff pressured Plaintiff not to report Frank Livoti's and Tilia Livoti's sexual abuse of her.

55. At no time did the Diocese ever send an official, a member of the clergy, an investigator or any employee or independent contractor to the Church to advise or provide any form of notice to the parishioners either verbally or in writing that there were credible allegations against Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti and to request that anyone who saw, suspected or suffered sexual abuse to come forward and file a report with the police department. Rather, the Diocese remained silent.

56. At all times material hereto, Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti, were under the direct supervision, employ and/or control of the Church.

57. At all times material hereto, Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti, were under the direct supervision, employ and/or control of the Diocese.

58. The Church knew and/or reasonably should have known, and/or knowingly condoned, and/or covered up, the inappropriate and unlawful sexual activities of Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti who sexually abused Plaintiff.

59. The Diocese knew and/or reasonably should have known, and/or knowingly condoned, and/or covered up, the inappropriate and unlawful sexual activities of Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti who sexually abused Plaintiff.

60. The Church negligently or recklessly believed that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti were fit to work with children and/or that any previous problems they had were fixed and cured; that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti would not sexually molest children; and that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti would not injure children.

61. The Diocese negligently or recklessly believed that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti were fit to work with children and/or that any previous problems they had were fixed and cured; that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti would not sexually molest children; and that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti would not injure children.

62. The Church had the responsibility to supervise and/or direct volunteers and/or teachers serving at the Church, and specifically, had a duty not to aid pedophiles such as Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti, by assigning, maintaining and/or appointing them to a position with access to minors.

63. The Diocese had the responsibility to supervise and/or direct volunteers and/or teachers serving at the Church, and specifically, had a duty not to aid pedophiles such as Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti, by assigning, maintaining and/or appointing them to a position with access to minors.

64. By holding Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti out as safe to work with children, and by undertaking the physical custody, supervision of, and/or care of the minor Plaintiff, the Church entered into a fiduciary relationship with the minor Plaintiff. As a result of Plaintiff's being a minor, and by the Church undertaking the care and guidance of the vulnerable minor Plaintiff, the Church held a position of empowerment over Plaintiff.

65. By holding Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti out as safe to work with children, and by undertaking the physical custody, supervision of, and/or care of the minor Plaintiff, the Diocese entered into a fiduciary relationship with the minor Plaintiff. As a result of Plaintiff's being a minor, and by the Diocese undertaking the care and guidance of the vulnerable minor Plaintiff, the Diocese held a position of empowerment over Plaintiff.

66. The Church, by holding itself out as being able to provide a safe environment for children, solicited and/or accepted this position of empowerment. This empowerment prevented the then minor Plaintiff from effectively protecting herself. The Church thus entered into a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiff.

67. The Diocese, by holding itself out as being able to provide a safe environment for children, solicited and/or accepted this position of empowerment. This empowerment prevented the then minor Plaintiff from effectively protecting herself. The Diocese thus entered into a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiff.

68. The Church had a special relationship with Plaintiff.

69. The Diocese had a special relationship with Plaintiff.

70. The Church owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care because the Church had superior knowledge about the risk that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti posed to Plaintiff, the risk of abuse in general in its programs, and/or the risks that its facilities posed to minor children.

71. The Diocese owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care because the Diocese had superior knowledge about the risk that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti posed to Plaintiff, the risk of abuse in general in its programs, and/or the risks that its facilities posed to minor children.

72. The Church owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care because it solicited youth and parents for participation in its youth programs; encouraged youth and parents to have the youth participate in its programs; undertook custody of minor children, including Plaintiff; promoted its facilities and programs as being safe for children; held its agents including Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti out as safe to work with children; encouraged parents and children to spend time with its agents; and/or encouraged its agents, including Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti, to spend time with, interact with, and recruit children.

73. The Diocese owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care because it solicited youth and parents for participation in its youth programs; encouraged youth and parents to have the youth participate in its programs; undertook custody of minor children, including Plaintiff; promoted its facilities and programs as being safe for children; held its agents including Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti out as safe to work with children; encouraged parents and children to spend time with its agents; and/or encouraged its agents, including Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti, to spend time with, interact with, and recruit children.

74. The Church owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from harm because the Church's actions created a foreseeable risk of harm to Plaintiff.

75. The Diocese owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from harm because the Diocese's actions created a foreseeable risk of harm to Plaintiff.

76. The Church's breach of its duties include, but are not limited to: failure to have sufficient policies and procedures to prevent child sexual abuse, failure to properly implement the policies and procedures to prevent child sexual abuse, failure to take reasonable measures to make sure that the policies and procedures to prevent child sexual abuse were working, failure to adequately inform families and children or the risks of child sexual abuse, failure to investigate risks of child sexual abuse, failure to properly train the workers and volunteers at institutions and programs within the Church, failure to protect children in its programs from child sexual abuse, failure to adhere to the applicable standard of care for child safety, failure to investigate the amount and type of information necessary to represent the institutions, programs, leaders and people as safe, failure to train its volunteers, employees, and/or agents properly to identify signs of child molestation by fellow volunteers, employees, and/or agents, failure by relying on mental health professionals and/or failure by relying on people who claimed that they could treat child molesters.

77. The Diocese's breach of its duties include, but are not limited to: failure to have sufficient policies and procedures to prevent child sexual abuse, failure to properly implement the policies and procedures to prevent child sexual abuse, failure to take reasonable measures to make sure that the policies and procedures to prevent child sexual abuse were working, failure to adequately inform families and children or the risks of child sexual abuse, failure to investigate risks of child sexual abuse, failure to properly train the workers and/or volunteers at institutions and programs within the Diocese's geographical confines, failure to protect children in its programs from child sexual abuse, failure to adhere to the applicable standard of care for child safety, failure to investigate the amount and type of information necessary to represent the

institutions, programs, leaders and people as safe, failure to train its volunteers, employees, and/or agents properly to identify signs of child molestation by fellow employees, volunteers, and/or agents, failure by relying on mental health professionals and/or failure by relying on people who claimed that they could treat child molesters.

78. The Church also breached its duties to Plaintiff by failing to warn Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family of the risk that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti posed and the risks of child sexual abuse by clerics, teachers, and/or volunteers of the Church.

79. The Church also failed to warn Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family about any of the knowledge that it had about child sexual abuse.

80. The Diocese also breached its duties to Plaintiff by failing to warn Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family of the risk that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti posed and the risks of child sexual abuse by clerics, teachers, and/or volunteers of the Diocese.

81. The Diocese also failed to warn Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family about any of the knowledge that it had about child sexual abuse.

82. The Church also violated a legal duty by failing to report known and/or suspected abuse of children by Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti and/or its other agents to the police and law enforcement.

83. The Diocese also violated a legal duty by failing to report known and/or suspected abuse of children by Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti and/or its other agents to the police and law enforcement.

84. By employing and/or allowing Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti to volunteer at the Church, and other facilities within the Diocese, the Diocese, through its agents, affirmatively represented to minor children and their families that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti did not pose a

threat to children, did not have a history of molesting children, that the Diocese did not know that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti had a history of molesting children, and that the Diocese did not know that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti were a danger to children.

85. By employing and/or allowing Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti to volunteer at the Church, the Church through its agents, affirmatively represented to minor children and their families that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti did not pose a threat to children, did not have a history of molesting children, that the Church did not know that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti had a history of molesting children, and that the Church did not know that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti were a danger to children.

86. The Church induced Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family to rely on these representations and did rely on them.

87. The Diocese has never publicly admitted the veracity of the allegations against Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti, warned the public and/or conducted outreach to potential victims of his sexual abuse.

88. The pattern and practice of intentionally failing to disclose the identities and locations of sexually inappropriate and/or abusive clerics has been practiced by the Diocese for decades and continues through current day.

89. The failure to disclose the identities of allegedly sexually inappropriate and/or abusive clerics, teachers, and/or volunteers is unreasonable and knowingly or recklessly creates or maintains a condition which endangers the safety or health of a considerable number of members of the public, including Plaintiff.

90. By allowing Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti to remain in active ministry and/or volunteer at the Church, the Diocese, through its agents, has made and continues to make

affirmative representations to minor children and their families, including Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family, that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti do not pose a threat to children, do not have a history of molesting children, that the Diocese does not know that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti have a history of molesting children and that the Diocese does not know that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti were a danger to children.

91. The Diocese induced Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family to rely on these representations, and they did rely on them.

92. By allowing Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti to remain in active ministry, the Church, through its agents, has made and continues to make affirmative representations to minor children and their families, including Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family, that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti do not pose a threat to children, do not have a history of molesting children, that the Church does not know that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti have a history of molesting children and that the Church does not know that Frank Livoti and Tilia Livoti are a danger to children.

93. The Diocese ignored credible complaints about the sexually abusive behaviors of Church volunteers, teachers, and/or agents.

94. The Church ignored credible complaints about the sexually abusive behaviors of Church volunteers, teachers, and/or agents.

95. The Diocese engaged in conduct that resulted in the prevention, hinderance and delay in the discovery of criminal conduct by priests.

96. The Diocese conceived and agreed to a plan using deception and intimidation to prevent victims from seeking legal solutions to their problems.

97. As a result of Defendants' conduct described herein, Plaintiff has and will continue to suffer personal physical and psychological injuries, including but not limited to great pain of

mind and body, severe and permanent emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress, problems sleeping, concentrating, low self-confidence, low self-respect, low self-esteem, feeling of worthlessness, feeling shameful, and embarrassed, feeling alone and isolated, losing faith in God, losing faith in authority figures, feeling estranged from the church, struggling with alcohol and substance problems, struggling with gainful employment and career advancement, feeling helpless, and hopeless, problems with sexual intimacy, relationship problems, trust issues, feeling confused and angry, depression, anxiety, feeling dirty, used, and damaged, suicidal ideations, having traumatic flashbacks, feeling that his/her childhood and innocence was stolen. Plaintiff was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing Plaintiff's normal daily activities; has incurred and will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling; and, on information and belief, has incurred and will continue to incur loss of income and/or loss of earning capacity. As a victim of Defendants' misconduct, Plaintiff is unable at this time to fully describe all the details of that abuse and the extent of the harm Plaintiff suffered as a result.

98. The Church violated various New York statutes, including, but not limited to N.Y. Soc. Serv. Law §§ 413 and 420, which require, inter alia, school officials, teachers, day care center workers, providers of family or group family day care, and any other child care worker to report suspected cases of child abuse and impose liability for failure to report.

99. The Diocese violated various New York statutes, including, but not limited to N.Y. Soc. Serv. Law §§ 413 and 420, which require, inter alia, school officials, teachers, day care center workers, providers of family or group family day care, and any other child care worker to report suspected cases of child abuse and impose liability for failure to report.

100. The injuries and damages suffered by Plaintiff are specific in kind to Plaintiff, special, peculiar, and above and beyond those injuries and damages suffered by the public.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENCE

101. Plaintiff repeats and realleges by reference each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

102. The Church knew or was negligent in not knowing that Frank Livoti posed a threat of sexual abuse to children.

103. The Church knew or was negligent in not knowing that Tilia Livoti posed a threat of sexual abuse to children.

104. The Diocese knew or was negligent in not knowing that Frank Livoti posed a threat of sexual abuse to children.

105. The Diocese knew or was negligent in not knowing that Tilia Livoti posed a threat of sexual abuse to children.

106. The acts of Frank Livoti described hereinabove were undertaken, and/or enabled by, and/or during the course, and/or within the scope of his employment, appointment, and/or agency with the Church.

107. The acts of Tilia Livoti described hereinabove were undertaken, and/or enabled by, and/or during the course, and/or within the scope of her employment, appointment, and/or agency with the Church.

108. The acts of Frank Livoti described hereinabove were undertaken, and/or enabled by, and/or during the course, and/or within the scope of his employment, appointment, and/or agency with the Diocese.

109. The acts of Tilia Livoti described hereinabove were undertaken, and/or enabled by, and/or during the course, and/or within the scope of her employment, appointment, and/or agency with the Diocese.

110. The Church owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from Frank Livoti's sexual deviancy, both prior to and/or subsequent to Frank Livoti's misconduct.

111. The Church owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from Tilia Livoti's sexual deviancy, both prior to and/or subsequent to Tilia Livoti's misconduct.

112. The Diocese owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from Frank Livoti's sexual deviancy, both prior to and/or subsequent to Frank Livoti's misconduct.

113. The Diocese owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from Tilia Livoti's sexual deviancy, both prior to and/or subsequent to Tilia Livoti's misconduct.

114. The Church's willful, wanton, grossly negligent and/or negligent act(s) of commission and/or omission, resulted directly and/or proximately in the damages set forth herein at length.

115. The Diocese's willful, wanton, grossly negligent and/or negligent act(s) of commission and/or omission, resulted directly and/or proximately in the damages set forth herein at length.

116. At all times material hereto, with regard to the allegations contained herein, Frank Livoti was under the direct supervision, employ and/or control of the Church.

117. At all times material hereto, with regard to the allegations contained herein, Tilia Livoti was under the direct supervision, employ and/or control of the Church.

118. At all times material hereto, with regard to the allegations contained herein, Frank Livoti was under the direct supervision, employ and/or control of the Diocese.

119. At all times material hereto, with regard to the allegations contained herein, Tilia Livoti was under the direct supervision, employ and/or control of the Diocese.

120. At all times material hereto, the Church's actions were willful, wanton, malicious, reckless, grossly negligent and outrageous in its disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff.

121. At all times material hereto, the Diocese's actions were willful, wanton, malicious, reckless, grossly negligent and outrageous in its disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff.

122. As a direct and/or indirect result of said conduct, Plaintiff has suffered the injuries and damages described herein.

123. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants jointly, severally and/or in the alternative, are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory damages, and for punitive damages, together with interest and costs.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENT HIRING, RETENTION, SUPERVISION,
AND/OR DIRECTION**

124. Plaintiff repeats and realleges by reference each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

125. The Church hired Frank Livoti.

126. The Church hired Tilia Livoti.

127. The Church retained Frank Livoti as a volunteer.

128. The Church retained Tilia Livoti as a volunteer.

129. The Diocese hired Frank Livoti.

130. The Diocese hired Tilia Livoti.

131. The Diocese retained Frank Livoti as a volunteer.

132. The Church retained Tilia Livoti as a volunteer.

133. The Church hired Frank Livoti for a position that required him to work closely with, mentor, and counsel young boys and girls.

134. The Church hired Tilia Livoti for a position that required her to work closely with, mentor, and counsel young boys and girls.

135. The Diocese hired Frank Livoti for a position that required him to work closely with, mentor, and counsel young boys and girls.

136. The Diocese hired Tilia Livoti for a position that required her to work closely with, mentor, and counsel young boys and girls.

137. The Church was negligent in hiring and/or retaining Frank Livoti because it knew or should have known, through the exercise of reasonable care, of Frank Livoti's propensity to develop inappropriate relationships with children in its charge and to engage in sexual behavior and lewd and lascivious conduct with such children.

138. The Church was negligent in hiring and/or retaining Tilia Livoti because it knew or should have known, through the exercise of reasonable care, of Tilia Livoti's propensity to develop inappropriate relationships with children in its charge and to engage in sexual behavior and lewd and lascivious conduct with such children.

139. The Diocese was negligent in hiring and/or retaining Frank Livoti because it knew or should have known, through the exercise of reasonable care, of Frank Livoti's propensity to develop inappropriate relationships with children in its charge and to engage in sexual behavior and lewd and lascivious conduct with such children.

140. The Diocese was negligent in hiring and/or retaining Tilia Livoti because it knew or should have known, through the exercise of reasonable care, of Tilia Livoti's propensity to

develop inappropriate relationships with children in its charge and to engage in sexual behavior and lewd and lascivious conduct with such children.

141. Frank Livoti would not and could not have been in a position to sexually abuse Plaintiff had he not been hired and/or retained by the Church to mentor, teach, and counsel children in the Church.

142. Tilia Livoti would not and could not have been in a position to sexually abuse Plaintiff had she not been hired and/or retained by the Church to mentor, teach, and counsel children in the Church.

143. Frank Livoti continued to molest Plaintiff while at the Church.

144. Tilia Livoti continued to molest Plaintiff while at the Church.

145. Frank Livoti would not and could not have been in a position to sexually abuse Plaintiff had he not been hired and/or retained by the Diocese to mentor, teach, and counsel children in the Church.

146. Tilia Livoti would not and could not have been in a position to sexually abuse Plaintiff had she not been hired and/or retained by the Diocese to mentor and counsel children in the Church.

147. The harm complained of herein was foreseeable.

148. Plaintiff would not have suffered the foreseeable harm complained of herein but for the negligence of the Church in having placed and/or allowed Frank Livoti to remain in his position.

149. Plaintiff would not have suffered the foreseeable harm complained of herein but for the negligence of the Church in having placed and/or allowed Tilia Livoti to remain in her position.

150. Plaintiff would not have suffered the foreseeable harm complained of herein but for the negligence of the Diocese in having placed and/or allowed Frank Livoti to remain in his position.

151. Plaintiff would not have suffered the foreseeable harm complained of herein but for the negligence of the Diocese in having placed and/or allowed Tilia Livoti to remain in her position.

152. At all times while Frank Livoti was employed or appointed by the Church, he was supervised by the Church and/or its agents and employees.

153. At all times while Tilia Livoti was employed or appointed by the Church, she was supervised by the Church and/or its agents and employees.

154. At all times while Frank Livoti was employed or appointed by the Church, he was under the direction of, and/or answerable to, the Church and/or its agents and employees.

155. At all times while Tilia Livoti was employed or appointed by the Church, she was under the direction of, and/or answerable to, the Church and/or its agents and employees.

156. At all times while Frank Livoti was employed or appointed by the Diocese, he was supervised by the Diocese and/or its agents and employees.

157. At all times while Tilia Livoti was employed or appointed by the Diocese, she was supervised by the Diocese and/or its agents and employees.

158. At all times while Frank Livoti was employed or appointed by the Diocese, he was under the direction of, and/or answerable to, the Diocese and/or its agents and employees.

159. At all times while Tilia Livoti was employed or appointed by the Diocese, she was under the direction of, and/or answerable to, the Diocese and/or its agents and employees.

160. The Church was negligent in its direction and/or supervision of Frank Livoti in that it knew or should have known, through the exercise of ordinary care, that Frank Livoti's conduct would subject third parties to an unreasonable risk of harm, including Frank Livoti's propensity to develop inappropriate relationships with children under his charge and to engage in sexual behavior and lewd and lascivious conduct with such children.

161. The Church was negligent in its direction and/or supervision of Tilia Livoti in that it knew or should have known, through the exercise of ordinary care, that Tilia Livoti's conduct would subject third parties to an unreasonable risk of harm, including Tilia Livoti's propensity to develop inappropriate relationships with children under her charge and to engage in sexual behavior and lewd and lascivious conduct with such children.

162. The Church failed to take steps to prevent such conduct from occurring.

163. The Diocese was negligent in its direction and/or supervision of Frank Livoti in that it knew, or should have known, through the exercise of ordinary care, that Frank Livoti's conduct would subject third parties to an unreasonable risk of harm, including Frank Livoti's propensity to develop inappropriate relationships with children under his charge and to engage in sexual behavior and lewd and lascivious conduct with such children.

164. The Diocese was negligent in its direction and/or supervision of Tilia Livoti in that it knew, or should have known, through the exercise of ordinary care, that Tilia Livoti's conduct would subject third parties to an unreasonable risk of harm, including Tilia Livoti's propensity to develop inappropriate relationships with children under her charge and to engage in sexual behavior and lewd and lascivious conduct with such children.

165. The Diocese failed to take steps to prevent such conduct from occurring.

166. The Church was negligent in its retention of Frank Livoti in that that it knew, or should have known, through the exercise of reasonable care, of his propensity to develop inappropriate relationships with children under his charge and to engage in sexual behavior and lewd and lascivious conduct with such children.

167. The Church was negligent in its retention of Tilia Livoti in that that it knew, or should have known, through the exercise of reasonable care, of her propensity to develop inappropriate relationships with children under her charge and to engage in sexual behavior and lewd and lascivious conduct with such children.

168. The Church retained Frank Livoti in his position as mentor, teacher, and counselor to such children and thus left him in a position to continue such behavior.

169. The Church retained Tilia Livoti in her position as mentor, teacher, and counselor to such children and thus left her in a position to continue such behavior.

170. The Diocese was negligent in its retention of Frank Livoti in that that it knew, or should have known, through the exercise of reasonable care, of his propensity to develop inappropriate relationships with children under his charge and to engage in sexual behavior and lewd and lascivious conduct with such children.

171. The Diocese was negligent in its retention of Tilia Livoti in that that it knew, or should have known, through the exercise of reasonable care, of her propensity to develop inappropriate relationships with children under his charge and to engage in sexual behavior and lewd and lascivious conduct with such children.

172. The Diocese retained Frank Livoti in his position as mentor, teacher, and counselor to such children and thus left him in a position to continue such behavior.

173. The Diocese retained Tilia Livoti in her position as mentor, teacher, and counselor to such children and thus left her in a position to continue such behavior.

174. Frank Livoti would not and could not have been in a position to sexually abuse Plaintiff had he not been negligently retained, supervised, and/or directed by the Church as a mentor, teacher, and counselor to the infant parishioners of the Church, including Plaintiff.

175. Tilia Livoti would not and could not have been in a position to sexually abuse Plaintiff had she not been negligently retained, supervised, and/or directed by the Church as a mentor, teacher, and counselor to the infant parishioners of the Church, including Plaintiff.

176. Frank Livoti would not and could not have been in a position to sexually abuse Plaintiff had he not been negligently retained, supervised, and/or directed by the Diocese as a mentor, teacher, and counselor to the infant parishioners of the Diocese, including Plaintiff.

177. Tilia Livoti would not and could not have been in a position to sexually abuse Plaintiff had she not been negligently retained, supervised, and/or directed by the Diocese as a mentor, teacher, and counselor to the infant parishioners of the Diocese, including Plaintiff.

178. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants, jointly, severally and/or in the alternative, are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory damages, and for punitive damages, together with interest and costs.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY

179. Plaintiff repeats and realleges by reference each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

180. Through the position to which Frank Livoti was assigned by the Church, Frank Livoti was placed in direct contact with Plaintiff.

181. Through the position to which Tilia Livoti was assigned by the Church, Tilia Livoti was placed in direct contact with Plaintiff.

182. Frank Livoti was a teacher, mentor, and/or volunteer at the Church, including as a teacher assigned to teach Plaintiff.

183. Tilia Livoti was assigned as a was a teacher, mentor, and/or volunteer at the Church, including as a teacher assigned to teach Plaintiff.

184. It was under these circumstances that Plaintiff was entrusted to the care of the Church and - under its authority - came to be under the direction, control and dominance of, Frank Livoti.

185. It was under these circumstances that Plaintiff was entrusted to the care of the Church and - under its authority - came to be under the direction, control and dominance of, Tilia Livoti.

186. As a result, Frank Livoti used his position to sexually abuse and harass Plaintiff.

187. As a result, Tilia Livoti used her position to sexually abuse and harass Plaintiff.

188. Through the position to which Frank Livoti was assigned by the Diocese, Frank Livoti was put in direct contact with Plaintiff, then a minor.

189. Through the position to which Tilia Livoti was assigned by the Diocese, Tilia Livoti was put in direct contact with Plaintiff, then a minor.

190. As a result, Frank Livoti used his position to sexually abuse and harass Plaintiff.

191. As a result, Tilia Livoti used her position to sexually abuse and harass Plaintiff.

192. There existed a fiduciary relationship of trust, confidence, and reliance between Plaintiff and the Church.

193. There existed a fiduciary relationship of trust, confidence, and reliance between Plaintiff and the Diocese.

194. Pursuant to its fiduciary relationship, the Church was entrusted with the well-being, care, and safety of Plaintiff.

195. Pursuant to its fiduciary relationship, the Diocese was entrusted with the well-being, care, and safety of Plaintiff.

196. Pursuant to its fiduciary relationship, the Church assumed a duty to act in the best interests of Plaintiff.

197. Pursuant to its fiduciary relationship, the Diocese assumed a duty to act in the best interests of Plaintiff.

198. The Church breached its fiduciary duties to Plaintiff.

199. The Diocese breached its fiduciary duties to Plaintiff.

200. At all times material hereto, the Church's actions and/or inactions were willful, wanton, malicious, reckless, grossly negligent and/or outrageous in its disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff.

201. At all times material hereto, the Diocese's actions and/or inactions were willful, wanton, malicious, reckless, grossly negligent and/or outrageous in its disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff.

202. As a direct result of said conduct, Plaintiff has suffered the injuries and damages described herein.

203. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants, jointly, severally and/or in the alternative, are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages, together with interest and costs.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION: BREACH OF NON-DELEGABLE DUTY

204. Plaintiff repeats and realleges by reference each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

205. Plaintiff, when a minor, was placed in the care of the Church for the purposes of, inter alia, providing Plaintiff with a safe environment to receive an education.

206. As a result, there existed a non-delegable duty of trust between Plaintiff and the Church.

207. When Plaintiff was a minor, Plaintiff was placed in the care of the Diocese for the purposes of, inter alia, providing Plaintiff with a safe environment to receive an education.

208. As a result, there existed a non-delegable duty of trust between Plaintiff and the Diocese.

209. Plaintiff was a vulnerable child when placed within the care of the Church.

210. Plaintiff was a vulnerable child when placed within the care of the Diocese.

211. Consequently, the Church was in the best position to prevent Plaintiff's abuse, and to learn of Frank Livoti's repeated sexual abuse of Plaintiff and stop it.

212. Consequently, the Church was in the best position to prevent Plaintiff's abuse, and to learn of Tilia Livoti's repeated sexual abuse of Plaintiff and stop it.

213. Consequently, the Diocese was in the best position to prevent Plaintiff's abuse, and to learn of Frank Livoti's repeated sexual abuse of Plaintiff and stop it.

214. Consequently, the Diocese was in the best position to prevent Plaintiff's abuse, and to learn of Tilia Livoti's repeated sexual abuse of Plaintiff and stop it.

215. By virtue of the fact that Plaintiff was sexually abused as a minor student entrusted to the care of the Church, the Church breached its non-delegable duty to Plaintiff.

216. By virtue of the fact that Plaintiff was sexually abused as a minor student entrusted to the care of the Diocese, the Diocese breached its non-delegable duty to Plaintiff.

217. At all times material hereto, Frank Livoti was under the direct supervision, employ and/or control of the Church.

218. At all times material hereto, Tilia Livoti was under the direct supervision, employ and/or control of the Church.

219. At all times material hereto, Frank Livoti was under the direct supervision, employ and/or control of the Diocese.

220. At all times material hereto, Tilia Livoti was under the direct supervision, employ and/or control of the Diocese.

221. As a direct result of said conduct, Plaintiff has suffered the injuries and damages described herein.

222. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants, jointly, severally and/or in the alternative, are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages, together with interest and costs.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION: BREACH OF DUTY IN LOCO PARENTIS

223. Plaintiff repeats and realleges by reference each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

224. Plaintiff was a minor when her parents entrusted her to the control of the Church for the purpose of, inter alia, providing Plaintiff with an education.

225. The Church owed a duty to adequately supervise its students to prevent foreseeable harms and injuries.

226. As a result, the Church owed a duty to Plaintiff in loco parentis.

227. Plaintiff was a minor when her parents entrusted her to the control of the Diocese for the purposes of, inter alia, providing Plaintiff with an education.

228. The Diocese owed a duty to adequately supervise its students to prevent foreseeable injuries.

229. As a result, the Diocese owed a duty to Plaintiff in loco parentis.

230. The Church breached its duty in loco parentis.

231. The Diocese breached its duty in loco parentis.

232. At all times material hereto, the Church's actions were willful, wanton, malicious, reckless, negligent, grossly negligent and/or outrageous in its disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff.

233. At all times material hereto, the Diocese's actions were willful, wanton, malicious, reckless, negligent, grossly negligent and/or outrageous in its disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff.

234. As a direct result of the Church's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered the injuries and damages described herein.

235. As a direct result of the Diocese's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered the injuries and damages described herein.

236. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants, jointly, severally and/or in the alternative, are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages, together with interest and costs.

**SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION: INTENTIONAL INFILCTION OF
EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

237. Plaintiff repeats and realleges by reference each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

238. At the time Frank Livoti molested Plaintiff, which Frank Livoti knew would cause, or disregarded the substantial probability that it would cause, severe emotional distress, the Church employed and/or retained Frank Livoti as Plaintiff's mentor, teacher, and counselor.

239. At the time Tilia Livoti molested Plaintiff, which Tilia Livoti knew would cause, or disregarded the substantial probability that it would cause, severe emotional distress, the Church employed and/or retained Tilia Livoti as Plaintiff's mentor, teacher, and counselor.

240. It was part of Frank Livoti job as role model, teacher, and mentor to gain Plaintiff's trust. Frank Livoti used his position, and the representations made by the Church about his character that accompanied that position, to gain Plaintiff's trust and confidence and to create opportunities to violate Plaintiff.

241. It was part of Tilia Livoti's job as role model, teacher, and mentor to gain Plaintiff's trust. Tilia Livoti used her position, and the representations made by the Church about her character that accompanied that position, to gain Plaintiff's trust and confidence and to create opportunities to violate Plaintiff.

242. At the time Frank Livoti molested Plaintiff, which Frank Livoti knew would cause, or disregarded the substantial probability that it would cause, severe emotional distress, the Diocese employed Frank Livoti as Plaintiff's mentor and counselor.

243. At the time Tilia Livoti molested Plaintiff, which Tilia Livoti knew would cause, or disregarded the substantial probability that it would cause, severe emotional distress, the Diocese employed Tilia Livoti as Plaintiff's mentor, teacher, and counselor.

244. It was part of Frank Livoti's position as role model, teacher and mentor to gain Plaintiff's trust. Frank Livoti used his position, and the representations made by the Diocese about

his character that accompanied that position, to gain Plaintiff's trust and confidence and to create opportunities to violate Plaintiff.

245. It was part of Tilia Livoti's job as role model, teacher, and mentor to gain Plaintiff's trust. Tilia Livoti used her position, and the representations made by the Diocese about her character that accompanied that position, to gain Plaintiff's trust and confidence and to create opportunities to violate Plaintiff.

246. The Church knew and/or disregarded the substantial probability that Frank Livoti's conduct would cause severe emotional distress to Plaintiff.

247. The Church knew and/or disregarded the substantial probability that Tilia Livoti's conduct would cause severe emotional distress to Plaintiff.

248. The Diocese knew and/or disregarded the substantial probability that Frank Livoti's conduct would cause severe emotional distress to Plaintiff.

249. The Diocese knew and/or disregarded the substantial probability that Tilia Livoti's conduct would cause severe emotional distress to Plaintiff.

250. Plaintiff suffered severe emotional distress, including psychological and emotional injury as described above.

251. This distress was caused by Frank Livoti's sexual abuse of Plaintiff.

252. This distress was caused by Tilia Livoti's sexual abuse of Plaintiff.

253. The sexual abuse of Plaintiff was extreme and outrageous conduct, beyond all possible bounds of decency, atrocious and intolerable in a civilized community.

254. The Church is liable for Frank Livoti's conduct under the doctrine of respondeat superior.

255. The Church is liable for Tilia Livoti's conduct under the doctrine of *respondeat superior.*

256. The Diocese is liable for Frank Livoti's conduct under the doctrine of *respondeat superior.*

257. The Diocese is liable for Tilia Livoti's conduct under the doctrine of *respondeat superior.*

258. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants, jointly, severally and/or in the alternative, are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory and punitive damages, together with interest and costs.

**SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENT INFILCTION OF
EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

259. Plaintiff repeats and realleges by reference each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

260. As set forth at length herein, the actions of the Church, its predecessors and/or successors, agents, servants and/or employees, were conducted in a negligent and/or grossly negligent manner.

261. As set forth at length herein, the actions of the Diocese, its predecessors and/or successors, agents, servants and/or employees were conducted in a negligent and/or grossly negligent manner.

262. The Church's actions endangered Plaintiff's safety and caused her to fear for her own safety.

263. The Diocese's actions endangered Plaintiff's safety and caused her to fear for her own safety.

264. As a direct and proximate result of the Church's actions, which included but were not limited to, negligent and/or grossly negligent conduct, Plaintiff suffered the severe injuries and damages described herein, including but not limited to, mental and emotional distress.

265. As a direct and proximate result of the Diocese's actions, which included but were not limited to, negligent and/or grossly negligent conduct, Plaintiff suffered the severe injuries and damages described herein, including but not limited to, mental and emotional distress.

266. In addition to its own direct liability for negligently inflicting emotional distress on Plaintiff, the Church is also liable for Frank Livoti's negligent infliction of emotional distress under the doctrine of *respondeat superior*.

267. In addition to its own direct liability for negligently inflicting emotional distress on Plaintiff, the Church is also liable for Tilia Livoti's negligent infliction of emotional distress under the doctrine of *respondeat superior*.

268. At the time Frank Livoti breached his duty to Plaintiff, Frank Livoti was employed and/or volunteered as Plaintiff's mentor, teacher, and counselor by the Church.

269. At the time Tilia Livoti breached her duty to Plaintiff, Tilia Livoti was employed and/or volunteered as Plaintiff's mentor, teacher, and counselor by the Church.

270. It was part of Frank Livoti's position as role model, teacher, and mentor to gain Plaintiff's trust. Frank Livoti used his position, and the representations made by the Church about his character that accompanied that position, to gain Plaintiff's trust and confidence and to create opportunities to be alone with, and touch, Plaintiff.

271. It was part of Tilia Livoti's position as role model, teacher, and mentor to gain Plaintiff's trust. Tilia Livoti used her position, and the representations made by the Church about

her character that accompanied that position, to gain Plaintiff's trust and confidence and to create opportunities to be alone with, and touch, Plaintiff.

272. In addition to its own direct liability for negligently inflicting emotional distress on Plaintiff, the Diocese is also liable for Frank Livoti's negligent infliction of emotional distress under the doctrine of *respondeat superior*.

273. In addition to its own direct liability for negligently inflicting emotional distress on Plaintiff, the Diocese is also liable for Tilia Livoti's negligent infliction of emotional distress under the doctrine of *respondeat superior*.

274. At the time Frank Livoti breached his duty to Plaintiff, Frank Livoti was employed and/or retained as Plaintiff's mentor, teacher, and counselor by the Diocese.

275. At the time Tilia Livoti breached her duty to Plaintiff, Tilia Livoti was employed and/or retained as Plaintiff's mentor, teacher, and counselor by the Diocese.

276. It was part of Frank Livoti's position as role model, teacher, and mentor to gain Plaintiff's trust. Frank Livoti used his position, and the representations made by the Diocese about his character that accompanied that position, to gain Plaintiff's trust and confidence and to create opportunities to be alone with, and touch, Plaintiff.

277. It was part of Tilia Livoti's position as role model, teacher, and mentor to gain Plaintiff's trust. Tilia Livoti used her position, and the representations made by the Diocese about her character that accompanied that position, to gain Plaintiff's trust and confidence and to create opportunities to be alone with, and touch, Plaintiff.

278. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants, jointly, severally and/or in the alternative, are liable to Plaintiff for compensatory damages and punitive damages, together with interest and costs.

**EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION: BREACH OF STATUTORY DUTY TO REPORT
ABUSE UNDER SOC. SERV. LAW §§ 413 and 420**

279. Plaintiff repeats and realleges by reference each and every allegation set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

280. Pursuant to N.Y. Soc. Serv. Law §§ 413 and 420, the Church, including but not limited to its teachers, administrators, and other school personnel, had a statutorily imposed duty to report reasonable suspicion of abuse of children in its care.

281. Pursuant to N.Y. Soc. Serv. Law §§ 413 and 420, the Diocese, including but not limited to its teachers, administrators, and other school personnel, had a statutorily imposed duty to report reasonable suspicion of abuse of children in its care.

282. The Church breached that duty by knowingly and willfully failing to report reasonable suspicion of abuse by Frank Livoti of children in its care.

283. The Church breached that duty by knowingly and willfully failing to report reasonable suspicion of abuse by Tilia Livoti of children in its care.

284. The Diocese breached that duty by knowingly and willfully failing to report reasonable suspicion of abuse by Frank Livoti of children in its care.

285. The Diocese breached that duty by knowingly and willfully failing to report reasonable suspicion of abuse by Tilia Livoti of children in its care.

286. As a direct and/or indirect result of said conduct, Plaintiff has suffered injuries and damages described herein.

287. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants, jointly, severally and/or in the alternative, are liable to plaintiff for compensatory damages, and for punitive damages, together with interest and costs.


288. The limitations of liability set forth in Article 16 of the CPLR do not apply to the causes of action alleged herein.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully requested that the Court grant judgment in this action in favor of the Plaintiff, and against the Defendants, in a sum of money in excess of the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts which would otherwise have jurisdiction, together with all applicable interest, costs, disbursements, as well as punitive damages and such other, further and different relief as the Court in its discretion shall deem to be just, proper and equitable.


Plaintiff further places Defendants on notice and reserves the right to interpose claims sounding in Fraudulent Concealment, Deceptive Practices and/or Civil Conspiracy should the facts and discovery materials support such claims.

Dated: New York, New York
November 4, 2019

Yours, etc.,


By: Adam P. Slater, Esq.
SLATER SLATER SCHULMAN LLP
Counsel for Plaintiff
488 Madison Avenue, 20th Floor
New York, New York 10022
(212) 922-0906

-and-


By: Gary Certain, Esq.
CERTAIN & ZILBERG, PLLC
Counsel for Plaintiff
488 Madison Avenue, 20th Floor
New York, New York 10022

STATE OF NEW YORK)
 : ss.:
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK)

Nicole Demartino f/k/a Carmel-Ann Nicole Iacontino, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

I am a Plaintiff in the action herein: I have read the annexed

COMPLAINT

and know the contents thereof, and the same are true to my knowledge, except those matters therein which are stated to be alleged upon information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true. My belief as to those matters therein not stated upon knowledge, is based upon facts, records, and other pertinent information contained in my personal files.

Dated: Melville, New York
October 29, 2019


NICOLE DEMARTINO f/k/a
CARMEL-ANN NICOLE IACONTINO

Sworn to before me this
the 29 day of October, 2019


Notary Public

LINC LEDER
NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF NEW YORK
No. 02LE6202051
Qualified in Suffolk County
My Commission Expires 03-09-2021

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NASSAU

-----X

NICOLE DEMARTINO f/k/a CARMEL-ANN NICOLE
IACONTINO, Index No.:

Plaintiff,

- against -

THE DIOCESE OF ROCKVILLE CENTRE and ST.
MARTIN OF TOURS,

Defendants.

-----X

SUMMONS & VERIFIED COMPLAINT

Slater Slater Schulman LLP
Attorneys For Plaintiff
488 Madison Avenue, 20th Floor
New York, New York 10022


(212)922-0906


Certain & Zilberg, PLLC
Attorneys For Plaintiff
488 Madison Avenue, 20th Floor
New York, New York 10022

(212)687-7800

CERTIFICATION

Pursuant to 22 NYCRR §130-1.1-a, the undersigned, an attorney duly admitted to practice in the courts of the State of New York, certifies that, upon information and belief, and reasonable inquiry, the contentions contained in the annexed document are not frivolous as defined in subsection (c) of the aforesaid section.


Adam P. Slater, Esq.


Gary Certain, Esq.